|    | Case 1:21-cv-01459-DAD-BAM Docume                                                                     | ent 8 Filed 04/01/22 Page 1 of 2 |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1  |                                                                                                       |                                  |
| 2  |                                                                                                       |                                  |
| 3  |                                                                                                       |                                  |
| 4  |                                                                                                       |                                  |
| 5  |                                                                                                       |                                  |
| 6  |                                                                                                       |                                  |
| 7  |                                                                                                       |                                  |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT                                                                          |                                  |
| 9  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA                                                                |                                  |
| 10 |                                                                                                       |                                  |
| 11 | JOSE A. ROJAS BARRIGA,                                                                                | No. 1:21-cv-01459-DAD-BAM (PC)   |
| 12 | Plaintiff,                                                                                            |                                  |
| 13 | v.                                                                                                    | ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND      |
| 14 | B. CATES, et al.,                                                                                     | RECOMMENDATIONS                  |
| 15 | Defendants.                                                                                           | (Doc. No. 7)                     |
| 16 |                                                                                                       |                                  |
| 17 | Plaintiff Jose A. Rojas Barriga is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights            |                                  |
| 18 | action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate     |                                  |
| 19 | Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.                                        |                                  |
| 20 | On January 4, 2022, the assigned magistrate judge issued a screening order granting                   |                                  |
| 21 | plaintiff leave to file a first amended complaint or a notice of voluntary dismissal within thirty    |                                  |
| 22 | (30) days of that order. (Doc. No. 5.) Plaintiff was warned that failure to comply with the court's   |                                  |
| 23 | order would result in a recommendation for dismissal of this action with prejudice due to             |                                  |
| 24 | plaintiff's failure to obey a court order and failure to state a claim. (Id. at 9.) Plaintiff has not |                                  |
| 25 | filed an amended complaint nor otherwise communicated with the court, and the time in which to        |                                  |
| 26 | do so has now passed.                                                                                 |                                  |
| 27 | On February 23, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations,                    |                                  |
| 28 | recommending that this action be dismissed with prejudice due to plaintiff's failure to state a       |                                  |
|    |                                                                                                       | 1                                |

## 1 claim upon which relief can be granted, failure to obey a court order, and failure to prosecute. 2 (Doc. No. 7.) Those findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice 3 that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (*Id.* at 11.) 4 Plaintiff has not filed objections, and the deadline in which to do so has now passed. 5 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a 6 de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings 7 and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. 8 Accordingly, 9 1. The findings and recommendations issued on February 23, 2022 (Doc. No. 7) are 10 adopted; 11 2. This case is dismissed with prejudice due to plaintiff's failure to state a claim, failure to obey a court order, and failure to prosecute; and 12 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case. 13 14 IT IS SO ORDERED. 15 March 31, 2022 Dated: 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

Case 1:21-cv-01459-DAD-BAM Document 8 Filed 04/01/22 Page 2 of 2

28